

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 27 remain in the application and stand rejected. Although this Request for Reconsideration is being timely filed, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Claims 1 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,229,888 to Miloslavsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,123 to Grunsted et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 9, 12, 15 – 18, 21 – 24 and 27, it is acknowledged that Miloslavsky fails to “disclose each of said one or more servers including call group lists of members for each call group, said each call group having listed members from said one or more call group locations.” Thus, Grunsted et al. is relied upon for this failing of Miloslavsky. Specifically, it is asserted that Grunsted et al. teaches “servers (See Fig. 2 and web server 210) including call group lists (e.g., phone lists and conference call groups) of members for each call group, said each call group having listed members (e.g., persons listed in the conference call group) from said one or more call group locations (See col. 4 lines 20-33 and col. 6 lines 18-43).” So, for a reason to combine, it is asserted that one would have been inclined “to employ this feature within system, as a way of making easier [sic] to **make conference calls** to the same group. This would improve the systems [sic] storage, as well as eliminate the need for a user to **dial** each telephone number for a group every time that he or she wishes to **make a conference call**.” (emphasis added). So, combining Grunsted et al. with Miloslavsky allows one to make conference calls from a Miloslavsky system. Perhaps, but it is respectfully submitted that this is not what any of claims 1 – 27 recites.

Claim 1, for example, recites group locations that are associated with different servers with lists of call group members, and “a group pickup request unit responsive to said invite request unit to establish a connection to a group pickup destination to **enable a caller station to be picked up from** said destination, said destination comprising any of said one or more group

locations and selected responsive to one of an alerting **listed** group member location and a responding **listed** group member location” at lines 7 – 10 (emphasis added). Similarly, independent claim 9 recites “**connecting a call pickup party with said parked caller**, said call pickup party being a **listed** group member connected at another one of said one or more group locations” at lines 10 – 11 (emphasis added); independent claim 12 recites “means for connecting a **listed** call pickup party with said parked caller,” at line 9 (emphasis added); independent claim 15 recites “a request unit to enable operation ... [for] an unanswered call at a **listed** member station; a connect unit ... [making] local and/or remote connections to ... **listed** group member stations ...;” at lines 5 – 10 (emphasis added); independent claim 22 recites “**establishing a connection between the calling station and a selected call pickup station**, wherein call pickup stations and unanswered stations are associated with **listed** members of the same call group and different servers” at lines 10 – 12 (emphasis added); and independent claim 27 recites “allows call pickup of any call **to** a listed group member **by any listed** group member station” at lines 7 – 9 (emphasis added). So, in other words, calls to listed members can be answered by other listed member stations.

Grunsted et al. teaches a telephone service system wherein “Users access the server to request enhanced telephone services such as immediate-response customer service calling (referred to as the ‘call me now’ function) and conferencing. The server then signals the telephone switch to make calls on a public switched telephone network in accordance with the user requests.” Col. 3, lines 52 – 57. The Grunsted et al. “call me now” function allows a user to initiate a call between the user and a customer service or sales representative, for example, from a web browser. *See, e.g.*, col. 5, line 5 – col. 6, line 15. When the user initiates such a call, first the Grunsted et al. system contacts the initiating user and then, contacts the customer service or sales representative. *Id.* However, neither is either of a conference call function or the Grunsted et al. “call me now” function (nor does Grunsted et al. suggest) anything that would allow answering calls to listed members by other listed member stations. Furthermore, there no suggestion in any reference or record to further modify the combination of Grunsted et al. and Miloslavsky to allow answering calls to listed members by other listed member stations as recited in any of claims 1, 9, 12, 15, 22 or 27. Therefore, since providing Miloslavsky with the Grunsted et al. “call me now” function or with ability to make conference calls, does not allow

that calls to listed members be answered by other listed members; the combination of Grunsted et al. and Miloslavsky does not result in the present invention as recited in claims 1, 9, 12, 15, 22, 27 or claims depending therefrom; and, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 9, 12, 15, 22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, regarding the rejection of “claims 3, 11, 14 and 26 [sic],” (The applicants believe that this, instead refers to the recitations of claim 27, not dependent claim 26.) it is asserted that “Grunsted, however, discloses the system and method, wherein said one or more servers is a plurality of servers, ones of said plurality being capable of controlling call service functions on others of said plurality of servers, and wherein a **call pickup party** may be located on any server within the network (See col. 4 lines 20-33 and col. 6 lines 18-43)” (emphasis added). However, as noted hereinabove, the Grunsted et al. “call me now” function, wherein a customer initiates connections between that customer and another party, does not involve a call pickup party, wherein calls to listed members can be answered by other listed member stations and wherein a call pickup party may be located on any server within the network. Therefore, providing Miloslavsky with the Grunsted et al. “call me now” function or with ability to make conference calls, does not result in the present invention as recited in any of claims 2, 11, 14 or 26/27, and *prima facie* obviousness has not been established. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 11, 14 or 26/27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Additionally, because dependent claims include all of the differences with the prior art as the claims from which they depend, claims 2 – 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 – 21 and 23 – 26, which depend from claims 1, 9, 12, 15 and 22, are not made obvious by the combination of Miloslavsky and Grunsted et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 – 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 – 21 and 23 – 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for efforts, both past and present, in examining the application. Believing the application to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 – 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allow the application to issue.

Once again, the applicants note that MPEP §706 "Rejection of Claims," subsection III, "PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER DISCLOSED BUT NOT CLAIMED" provides in pertinent part that

If **the examiner** is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the applicant intends to claim such subject matter, he or she **may note** in the Office action that **certain aspects or features** of the patentable invention have not been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims **may be given favorable consideration**.

(emphasis added.) The applicants believe that the matter presented in the written description of the present application is quite different than, and not suggested by, any reference of record. Accordingly, should the Examiner believe anything further may be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes.

Respectfully submitted,

September 22, 2006

(Date)

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3130

Francis G. Montgomery
Francis G. Montgomery
Reg. No. 41,202